

REMARKS

Allowance of Claims

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's allowance of Claims 24, 25, 28-30, 33-35, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 51, 53, 57-62, 72-74, 78-80, 84 and 86-90.

Applicant is amending Claims 44, 60-65, 84 and 86 to correct minor informalities in the claims and to better recite the claimed features. It is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered and allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 63, 69, 75 and 81

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 63, 69, 75 and 81 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito (US 5,818,083) together with Ham et al. (US 3,890,632). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to better recite the features of the present invention, Applicant is amending independent Claim 63 to recite the feature of "a pair of impurity regions formed at side edges of the channel forming region along a channel length direction respectively." It is respectfully submitted that this feature is not disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

More specifically, in the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Ito discloses a field oxide film 12d adjacent to side edges along the channel length direction and cites the sentence bridging cols. 7 and 8 in Ito.

The sentence bridging cols. 7 and 8 in Ito states "Further, the memory cell transistors thus constructed on the polysilicon substrate 12 are isolated from each other by a field oxide film 12d

that defines the device region.” As shown in Fig. 3 in Ito, field oxide 12d is provided adjacent to source region 12b and drain region 12c, not channel region 12a.

Claim 63 recites the features of a pair of impurity regions formed at side edges of the channel forming region along a channel length direction, and a field oxide film adjacent to the side edges (of the channel forming region along a channel length direction). Ito does not disclose or suggest a field oxide film formed at side edges of the channel forming region along a channel length direction. Hence, Ito does not disclose or suggest these claimed features of Claim 63. Therefore, independent Claim 63 is not disclosed or suggested by Ito (or Ham).

Applicant is also amending dependent Claim 69 to recite the feature of “wherein a length of the second impurity region is longer than a channel length in the channel length direction.” Applicant believes that this is an allowable feature over the prior art. This feature was previously added to Claims 24, 29 and 34, and then these claims were allowed.

Therefore, Claims 63, 69, 75 and 81 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references and are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 64, 70, 76, 82, 65, 71, 77 and 83

The Examiner also rejects Claims 64, 70, 76, 82, 65, 71, 77 and 83 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito together with Ham et al. and Liu et al. (US 5,814,854). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to better recite the features of the present invention, Applicant is amending independent Claims 64 and 65 in a manner similar to that discussed above for Claim 63.

Therefore, for similar reasons as Claim 63, independent Claims 64 and 65 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Applicant is also amending dependent Claims 70 and 71 to recite the feature of “wherein a length of the second impurity region is longer than a channel length in the channel length direction.” Applicant believes that this is an allowable feature over the prior art, as explained above.

Therefore, Claims 64, 70, 76, 82, 65, 71, 77 and 83 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references and are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant filed an information disclosure statement (IDS) on April 8, 2008. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: June 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,

CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.

200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568